

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated October 11, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-28, and 30-33 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 are independent. In the Office Action dated October 11, 2007, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-28, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, 22-28, and 30-33 remain in this application with Claim 21 being cancelled by this amendment without prejudice or disclaimer and Claims 5, 13, and 29 being previously cancelled. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

#### **I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action dated October 11, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-28, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,864 ("*O'Neil*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,004 ("*Knoerle*"). Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "associating a wireless call indication digit with the first outgoing communication" and "if the wireless terminal is determined to have the voice messaging system, the predetermined time period is configured for placing the second outgoing communication before the first outgoing communication is answered by the voice messaging system." Amended Claims 10, 18, and 26 each includes a

similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 5, lines 12-14 and page 17, lines 11-18.

Consistent with the embodiments of the invention, a service control point may determine if a service subscriber currently has a simultaneous ring service activated. (See specification, page 15, lines 3-5.) In situations where a subscriber's wireless unit has a voice messaging system, the voice messaging system may not answer before the landline unit rings. (See specification, page 5, lines 12-14.) The service control point may verify whether a subscriber's landline telecommunications unit and a subscriber's wireless telecommunications unit are available. (See specification, page 4, lines 7-8.) Accordingly, attempts to reach a subscriber's wireless unit may only be made when the wireless unit is available. (See specification, page 5, lines 11-12.) To connect a call to a subscriber's wireless unit, a service node may send a call to a CO switch with a wireless indicator, such as a wireless call indication digit in the redirecting\_number field. (See specification, page 17, lines 11-18.) Further, embodiments of the invention may accommodate inherent delays in wireless networks by routing the incoming call to a wireless unit a predetermined time period after routing it to the landline unit. (See specification, page 5, lines 14-17.)

In contrast, *O'Neil* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *O'Neil* merely discloses a system and method for providing telecommunication extension services to a subscriber unit. (See *O'Neil*, Abstract, lines 1-2.) *O'Neil's* method for telecommunication extension services comprises a check to determine whether an appropriate wireless unit is available for communication. (See *O'Neil*, col. 29, lines 23-24.) If the wireless unit is not available, then *O'Neil* provides conventional

telecommunications services to the subscriber unit. (See col. 29, lines 25-27.) If the check in *O'Neil* determines that the wireless unit is available, ringing is provided to the wireless unit and a corresponding wireline unit. (See col. 29, lines 29-31.) *O'Neil* further provides for the disconnection of an unanswered unit after another unit has answered. (See *O'Neil*, col. 23, lines 38-40.) A manual aspect of *O'Neil's* feature allows an answering party to provide an indication that the other call be disconnected. (See *O'Neil*, col. 24, lines 1-5.) This feature is useful in *O'Neil* when the other call is picked up by an answering machine or voice mail system. (See *O'Neil*, col. 24, lines 19-20.) In *O'Neil*, a predetermined time period is not used so that a second outgoing communication is placed before a first outgoing communication is answered by a voice messaging system and a wireless indicator is not associated with the outgoing communications. Rather, *O'Neil* discloses a manual feature allowing an answering party to disconnect a call picked up by an answering machine or voice mail system.

Furthermore, *Knoerle* does not overcome *O'Neil's* deficiencies. *Knoerle* discloses a simultaneous ringing service to a plurality of customer premises equipment. (See Abstract, lines 1-2.) In *Knoerle*, a centralized database of subscriber information and a service node is utilized to make multiple outbound calls from the service node to multiple telephone lines assigned to a subscriber. (See Abstract, lines 3-6.) Inbound calls to a primary subscriber wireline are intercepted and *Knoerle's* simultaneous ringing service is implemented. (See Abstract, lines 7-10.) For example, the subscriber in *Knoerle* may designate two different wireless lines and two other wirelines to receive simultaneous ringing. (See col. 5, lines 44-46.) When *Knoerle's* simultaneous ringing service receives a call, it sets a plurality of call timers. (See col. 5, lines 53-54.)

Accordingly, a Call\_Timer is set to the maximum time allowed for *Knoerle's* simultaneous ringing service to operate. (See col. 5, lines 55-57.) In *Knoerle*, if the Call\_Timer expires before any secondary lines are answered, the received call is connected to the primary subscriber wireline. (See col. 5, lines 58-60.) In *Knoerle*, a predetermined time period is not used so that a second outgoing communication is placed before a first outgoing communication is answered by a voice messaging system and a wireless indicator is not associated with the outgoing communications. Rather, *Knoerle's* simultaneous ringing service places outgoing calls based on call timers rather than voice messaging system detection.

Combining *O'Neil* with *Knoerle* would not have led to the claimed invention because *O'Neil* and *Knoerle*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "associating a wireless call indication digit with the first outgoing communication" or "if the wireless terminal is determined to have the voice messaging system, the predetermined time period is configured for placing the second outgoing communication before the first outgoing communication is answered by the voice messaging system," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 10, 18, and 26 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14-17, 19-20, 22-25, 27-28, and 30-33 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 10, 18, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of

this rejection of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14-17, 19-20, 22-25, 27-28, and 30-33.

## II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

Date: January 11, 2008

/D. Kent Stier/  
D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:bjr

